



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/084,350	02/28/2002	Kuang-Yao Lo	041781-5032	5643

9629 7590 08/30/2004

MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER

AN, SHAWN S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2613

DATE MAILED: 08/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/084,350	LO, KUANG-YAO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Shawn S An	2613	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mahler et al (6,396,534 B1).

Regarding claim 1, Mahler et al discloses a video monitoring method comprising:

providing a video camera (Fig. 1, 5) that generates a series of frame outputs, wherein each of the image regions containing a predetermined segment of a predetermined set of horizontal scan lines of the corresponding frame output, obtaining a reference brightness value for each of the image regions of a reference one of the frame outputs, obtaining a current brightness value for each of the image regions of a current one of the frame outputs, and comparing each of the current brightness values with a respective one of the reference brightness values to detect movement of an object into one of the image regions of the frame outputs (col. 5, lines 23-41).

Regarding claim 2, Mahler et al discloses movement being confirmed when the difference between the current brightness value and the respective reference brightness value exceeds a predetermined threshold (col. 5, lines 33-41).

Regarding claim 3, Mahler et al discloses activating an alarm upon detection that an object has moved into one of the image regions of the frame outputs (col. 5, lines 33-41).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mahler et al (6,396,534 B1) in view of Ito et al (6,404,455 A1).

Regarding claim 4, Mahler et al does not particularly disclose moving the camera in such that a succeeding one of the frame outputs is centered at one of the image regions of the current frame outputs, the current brightness value of the image regions having a largest difference with the respective difference value.

However, Ito et al teaches intruding object monitoring system comprising a camera moving in such that a succeeding one of the frame outputs is centered at one of the image regions of the current frame outputs, the current brightness value of the image regions having a largest difference with the respective difference value (col. 4, lines 62-67; col. 5, lines 1-17).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art employing a video monitoring method as taught by Mahler et al to incorporate Ito et al's teaching as above, so as to efficiently track an intruder or a moving object/person.

Regarding claims 5-7, the Examiner takes official notice that a surveillance camera comprising an array as an image region including columns and rows of equal number is well known in the surveillance art.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the array as an image region including columns and rows of equal number as a simple structure to detect an intruder or a moving object/person.

Regarding claim 8, Mahler et al discloses the image regions of each of the frame outputs do not overlap (col. 3, lines 8-15).

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

A) Ito et al (2001/0019357 A1), Intruding object monitoring method and intruding object monitoring system.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shawn S An whose telephone number is 703-305-0099. The examiner can normally be reached on Flex hours (10).

7. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

8. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



SSA

Primary Patent Examiner

8/25/04

Best Available Copy